

REMARKS/ARGUMENT

This is submitted in response to the Official Communication dated October 6, 2006.

A restriction requirement has been imposed with respect to Species I and Species II allegedly corresponding, respectively, to claims 1-17 and 47-68 on the one hand and claims 18-46 on the other hand.

Preliminarily, it is noted that independent claims 18, 41 and 62 have been amended to depend, respectively from claims 1, 24 and 47. In addition, it is respectfully asserted that the Species II differs from Species I only in that it additionally includes an image sensing scheduler 90 which provides two functions: a satellite selection means and a schedule generating means. These inventions are intertwined with the main invention and this is now reflected by the amendments to the claims herein. Certainly, the remaining independent claims in the application, namely, claims 1, 24 and 47 should be held generic to their other, respective, claims. Accordingly, the restriction requirement is respectfully traversed and all of the claims should be considered on the merits.

However, to the extent necessary to do so, applicant elects the claims of Species I.

Parenthetically, claim 19 has been amended to correct an error and 24 has been amended to add a support for the candidate frames.

Early and favorable consideration of the application are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



MAX MOSKOWITZ
Registration No.: 30,576
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700

MM:ck